

March 13, 1969

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sponsor of H.R. 8508, the bill to increase the debt limit, on which the House is to vote next week.

Mr. Speaker, following are the statements of the Republican Congressmen:

VOICES FROM THE REPUBLICAN PAST, OR,
WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

Rep. John Byrnes of Wisconsin in floor debate on June 18, 1964: "Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote and will not vote to give my approval to these debt ceiling increases in order to continue the spending programs that are contemplated. I believe some brakes should be put on. In my opinion this is the only brake I have at my disposal. We should either use the ceiling in a meaningful way or the majority on the committee might just as well be honest with the Congress and with the public and say, 'We are reporting out a bill repealing the debt ceiling legislation.' That would be the honest thing to do, unless you are going to use it to exert some pressure on spending. But what kind of restraint is it if you give them everything they want for spending and in addition a \$3 billion cushion in case they have incorrectly estimated their needs and then another \$4 billion in the banks?"

Rep. Joel T. Broyhill of Virginia in floor debate on June 18, 1964: "I cannot assume the responsibility for these reckless policies. My position has always been that in times of prosperity we should live within our revenues. I ask that my colleagues join with me in sending this bill back to committee. It is past time that we faced the issue squarely and put a halt to further deficits. It is obvious that the amount asked for refutes the false claims of economy being made by this administration. If these claims have any substance, the Congress would not have to increase the debt ceiling . . ."

Rep. William H. Harsha of Ohio in floor debate on June 9, 1964: "This administration is shoveling out federal money so fast it has run out of debt limit again. Since no one is raising the roof about it, the President wants to raise the ceiling, but it should not be called a ceiling, it is a fiscal hole he is digging and he wants to excavate more to put the Nation deeper in debt. We have again reached the time of year when the piper must be paid."

Rep. H. Allen Smith of California in floor debate on June 8, 1966: "Raising the debt limit, in my opinion, could be prevented if the President and the Congress would exercise greater restraint in their fiscal spending policies . . . Why does this debt limit have to go up at this particular time? The Government today has more money to play with than ever before. This year the Government will have the biggest tax take in our history."

Rep. Clarence J. Brown, Jr. of Ohio in floor debate on June 18, 1964: "Personally, I am opposed to increasing the national debt limit at this time, or at any other time, unless there is a grave and a great national emergency that would require such action in order to preserve our own security and our own way of life."

Rep. Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri in floor debate on June 18, 1964: "It is perfectly logical for Republicans, of course, to resist the expenditure policies of this administration, as we tried to under the Kennedy administration. This is a basic issue for the people to decide. I wish my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle would face it forthrightly. Their economic philosophy is to spend and finance it through deficits. The President does not submit a balanced budget to the Congress and has no intention of submitting a balanced budget in the foreseeable future. What we Republicans are fighting for and what we regard as fiscal responsibility is balancing the budget."

Rep. Bruce Alger of Texas in floor debate on June 18, 1964: "As a choice, of course, I would point out that Republicans have disapproved of an increase in the debt ceiling, and it is because they believe there can be

control in the rate of expenditures even as we are deciding where to reduce the total expenditure itself. We who are not responsible for this deficit financing believe that where it is legitimately and consistently possible, the debt ceiling increase can be opposed without being irresponsible."

Rep. Harold R. Collier of Illinois in debate on June 18, 1964: "If we vote to give the administration the debt limit increase it requests today, we are merely approving the continuation of fiscal conduct which can only lead to disaster. There are those of us who consistently practice economy in government through voting against programs which may be politically expedient but which we cannot afford if we are ever to emerge from the mire of indebtedness which we are merely passing on to the next generation as a rather sad heritage."

Rep. John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania, in floor debate on June 8, 1966: "Sometime in the future, if the cost of defending this country against Communist aggression becomes much more expensive than is currently estimated by the administration, there may be justification for increasing the debt limit. At the moment the request for further depreciation of the dollar cannot be defended, for cutbacks in bureaucratic extravagance would more than account for budget deficiencies. With sound fiscal policies it would in fact be possible to reduce the debt and thus fulfill an obligation not only to today's taxpayers, but to future generations which will incur the unpleasant consequences of the present administration's wasteful policies."

Rep. William G. Bray of Indiana, in floor debate on June 8, 1966: "I have opposed these temporary debt limit increases in the past and I am opposed to this one, not solely because of the amount of increase granted, nor of the rising cost of financing the public debt, but because congressional approval will, as the minority report on the bill points out, imply approval of the administration's fiscal policies."

Rep. Paul A. Fino of New York, in floor debate on February 8, 1967: "I rise in opposition to any further extension of the national debt ceiling. I do not think any member can deny that our government is spending too much as it is. This is not the year for a huge debt ceiling hike and a stiff tax increase. This is not the year to raise the bridge—if anything, this is the year to lower the water. In short, let us cut spending and let us stop raising the taxes of this generation and generations yet unborn."

Rep. Henry Schadeberg of Wisconsin, in floor debate on February 8, 1966: "I believe we have a responsibility to our people back home to take the necessary measures now that will force us and the administration to live within our income. I am aware that the need for the increase in the debt limit is due to the fact that the money has already been spent. Perhaps the present critical need for available money on the part of the Government needs to be dramatized so that we in Congress will be lulled out of our complacency about fiscal matters and the American people can see for themselves what is troubling our economy. My vote against the debt limit increase is one which is based on the firm conviction that the only way we can bring the wayward spenders into line is to cut off the source of supply of their funds and refuse them the right to squander today the wealth of tomorrow's generation in order that they may selfishly live high off the hog."

Rep. John T. Myers of Indiana in floor debate on February 8, 1967: "There are those who have called us irresponsible for opposing the administration proposal to hike the federal debt limit from \$330 billion to \$362 billion. It is my opinion our position is rather one of responsibility. Why even go through the motion of having a debt limitation if we are not going to observe it and raise it whenever it is politically expedient."

Rep. Louis C. Wyman of New Hampshire in floor debate on February 8, 1967: "Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote to increase the debt limit and keep faith with the people in my district who sent me to this 90th Congress. My constituents want the continuous overspending of the federal government brought to a stop, I pledged to do this. A vote to increase the debt limit is a license to continue federal overspending. It would be a breach of commitment to my constituents."

Rep. Donald Riegle Jr. of Michigan in floor debate on February 8, 1967: "The easiest thing for the government to do is to go into debt. For as long as the government can go deeper and deeper into debt—the more it can spend and spend and spend, then the more it can, in turn, expand the grasp of the federal government and its influence and control over the individual citizen. And that has been the pattern—borrow, borrow, borrow; spend, spend, spend—and let the country sink deeper and deeper and deeper into debt. I believe this country is already too deeply in debt."

Rep. Joe Skubitz of Kansas in floor debate on February 8, 1967: "I am fully aware of the problems which might result should the Congress refuse to increase the debt ceiling. But I know of no other way to sound the warning, to impress upon the spenders that we go this far and no further. There is virtue in a balanced budget and a limit to what we can afford. These principles are not so outmoded as to be ignored in our Great Society. The time has come when those who believe in a sound fiscal policy must vote against any proposal to increase the debt limit."

Rep. H. R. Gross of Iowa in floor debate on June 7, 1967: "We here today are trying to eat filet mignon steaks on a hamburger income. We are not skating on good solid financial ice in this country—we are just walking in the water with our skates on and a hell of a lot of people do not seem to know it. I am opposed to this enormous debt increase."

Rep. George Bush of Texas in floor debate on June 21, 1967: "I said last time—and I say again today—that before accepting a deficit of this magnitude, before being willing to risk the consequences of such a deficit, we had better tell the Administration again to take another look at their figures and come back to Congress with some constructive proposal for reducing the amount of the deficit. Rejection of the bill before you is our only hope."

Rep. Mark Andrews of North Dakota in floor debate on June 21, 1967: "There is no excuse, except in time of national emergency declared so by Congress, for a country to engage in deficit financing."

Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa in floor debate on June 21, 1967: "I shall again, as I have always in the past, vote against raising the debt limit. We must find ways and means to pay the bills that we pass on here in Congress other than what we have been doing presently, that is to raise the debt limit."

Rep. David T. Martin of Nebraska in floor debate on June 7, 1967: "This (debt interest) is the second largest item in our budget, next to the appropriations for the military. It seems to be the policy of the Great Society to go deeper and deeper into debt, saddling the burden of this debt and the increased interest charges on our children, our grandchildren, and future generations."

PROGRESS IN RACIAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH SCIENCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, professor of educational psy-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

chology and a research psychologist at the Institute of Human Learning—a research agency of the University of California at Berkeley—author in the field of psychology and vice president of the American Educational Research Association, has released a scholarly study, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" published by the Harvard Educational Review, winter 1969, No. 1, volume 39.

Dr. Jensen's thorough study into the taboo subject of heredity and environment is must reading for all serious students seeking positive answers to what is wrong in our domestic policies in the U.S. today.

For sure, Dr. Jensen's conclusions emphasize the need for reform in teaching techniques as well as an overall reevaluation of our domestic policies under the present forced social justice theories of the egalitarians.

"Compensatory" education now costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars is founded on false promises and is doomed to failure as long as it pursues old approaches stressing "cognitive" learning.

Dr. Jensen's tests also dismiss the environmental excuses heretofore promoted by Myrdal and others of the human experimenters who blame intellectual inadequacies on poverty and similar socio-economic rationalizations.

Now that the taboo has been lifted so that heredity and genetics have been properly restored as a legitimate study in behavioral science we can hope for additional research from other learned sources to aid in freeing mankind from the scourge of darkness that has descended upon our land.

Brown against Topeka is now discredited, truth and justice demand a new trial.

Mr. Speaker, I include reports from the U.S. News & World Report, Arizona Republic, Jackson Daily News, and Joseph Alsop's gasping and wistful dissent, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report]

CAN NEGROES LEARN THE WAY WHITES DO?

FINDINGS OF A TOP AUTHORITY

(Note.—Are all men created equal in ability to learn the same thing the same way? A noted professor of educational psychology—Dr. Arthur R. Jensen of the University of California—has reopened an old controversy by offering new arguments on that question. His study, entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" has just been published by the "Harvard Educational Review." It brings into issue some of the fundamental teaching methods used in racially mixed schools. The main points of his article are given below, as well as the reaction of other prominent authorities to his conclusions.)

Shock waves are rolling through the U.S. educational community over a frank and startling reappraisal of differences in classroom performance between whites and Negroes.

In a lengthy article, taking up most of the winter issue of the "Harvard Educational Review," one of the nation's leading educational psychologists, Dr. Arthur R. Jensen of the University of California at Berkeley, presents these major findings:

Negro scores averaging about 15 points below the white average on I.Q. tests must be taken seriously as evidence of genetic differences between the two races in learning patterns.

Research suggests that such a difference would tend to work against Negroes and against the "disadvantaged" generally when it comes to "cognitive" learning—abstract reasoning—which forms the basis for intelligence measurements and for the higher mental skills.

Conversely, Negroes and other "disadvantaged" children tend to do well in tasks involving rote learning—memorizing mainly through repetition—and some other skills, and these aptitudes can be used to help raise their scholastic achievement and job potential.

Unfortunately, big programs of "compensatory" education, now costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars a year, are doomed to failure as long as they pursue old approaches stressing "cognitive" learning.

The Berkeley psychologist, who also is vice president of the American Educational Research Association, stressed his view that "the full range of human talents is represented in all the major races of man and in all socioeconomic levels." He added, however, that research clearly shows differing patterns of average intellectual skills among the races.

GENETIC FACTORS IGNORED

Dr. Jensen acknowledged that far more research is needed to define the extent and nature of these differences, because "the possible importance of genetic factors . . . has been greatly ignored, almost to the point of being a tabooed subject." He strongly attacked the domination of educational theory by "environmentalists," who argue that all children except a rare few come equipped with the same learning mechanisms, and that differences in I.Q. scores are the result of social, economic, emotional and other pressures.

Cited by Dr. Jensen was the then U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, who proclaimed a few years ago that children "all have similar potential at birth—the differences occur thereafter."

There is now a growing realization among scholars in this field that discrepancies in performance "cannot be completely or directly attributed to discrimination or inequalities in education," Dr. Jensen said.

A REAPPRAISAL

Pointing to many admissions of failure in huge "compensatory" education programs for the poor, he asked:

"What has gone wrong? In other fields, when bridges do not stand, when aircraft do not fly, when machines do not work, when treatments do not cure . . . one begins to question the basic assumptions, principles, theories, and hypotheses that guide one's efforts. Is it time to follow suit in education?"

A fresh look at the whole problem of inequalities in the classroom, the Berkeley educator said, must begin with a re-examination of what "intelligence" really is. He stressed that the term "intelligence" is generally used by psychologists to apply to only a small part of the total range of mental ability, which also includes such qualities as acuteness of perception, motor behavior and memorizing skills.

As developed over the years, he said, the "intelligence test" is a sampling of abilities, oriented toward the middle-class child, by which testers can forecast likely performance in school and in occupational status and job capacities—not precisely, but within a small margin of error.

The crucial ability in this sampling is "cognitive" or "conceptual" learning—the capacity for abstract reasoning and problem-solving through classifying of similarities and dissimilarities. As observed by Dr. Jensen, it is this quality that has generated the world's great discoveries. It is this that enables children to proceed from rote learning to reasoning for themselves.

For most children, Dr. Jensen has found, this reasoning capacity begins to take hold in the first or second grade. But it does so at a varying pace and to varying degrees—and it is this variation that accounts in large

measure for the differences in I.Q. test scores in any sampling of children.

RAISING INTELLIGENCE

Can intelligence centering on the "cognitive" factor be raised as much as environmentalists claim?

Dr. Jensen's reply is No. His article took up at length many tests of children whose origins and upbringing were thought to offer some clues on this issue.

Of especial interest were studies of identical twins—those who develop from a single fertilized ovum and therefore have identical genetic endowment. These studies, Dr. Jensen said, showed that such twins, even if reared apart in dissimilar environments, still tend to develop I.Q.'s almost as similar as those of identical twins reared together.

Furthermore, he cited research indicating that children adopted shortly after birth are far more similar in I.Q. to their natural parents than to their adoptive parents.

Such studies, Dr. Jensen said, make it clear that "brain mechanisms which are involved in learning are genetically conditioned just as are other structures and functions of the organism." Altogether, his summation of studies on individual differences in I.Q. concluded that heredity accounts on the average for about 80 per cent of those individual variations, as against only 20 per cent resulting from environmental influences.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES

Contrarily, he did find much evidence that environment can play an important role in modifying actual performance in the classroom or on the job, without much changing I.Q. itself. Studies of twins, he said, suggested that individual differences in scholastic performance are determined only about half as much by heredity as are I.Q. variations.

This means, said Dr. Jensen, that "many other traits, habits, attitudes and values enter into a child's performance in school besides just his intelligence, and these non-cognitive factors are largely environmentally determined, mainly through influence within the child's family." I.Q. gains were described as being significant only when youngsters are removed from extreme, often bizarre, isolation and deprivation. Dr. Jensen found that the "disadvantaged" child often makes initial gain after a change for the better in environment, but then regresses toward his parents' level.

As an instance, he referred to a Milwaukee study last year of 586 children of 88 low-income Negro mothers living in a slum neighborhood which had only 5 per cent of the city's school population—but one third of the retarded children, defined as those with I.Q.'s of under 75. Of the 88 mothers, this study found, 45.4 per cent were below 80 in I.Q. Children of the low-I.Q. mothers suffered a systematic decline in intelligence testing, and in first grade accounted for four fifths of the children with under-80 I.Q.'s in the total sampling.

This study and others were seen as underlining the influence of genetic factors in the relationship of I.Q. showings to social and economic status. Similarly, Dr. Jensen said, heredity probably plays some role in the heavy representation of Negroes in America's lower socioeconomic groups.

HEREDITY FINDINGS

After looking over the accumulated research on this subject, Dr. Jensen summed up the major findings as follows:

Negroes, on the average, test about 15 I.Q. points below the white average. This discrepancy is about the same in school achievement rather consistently in Grades 1 through 12.

One study found that I.Q.'s below 75 have a much higher incidence among Negroes than among whites at every socioeconomic level. In the two highest of these levels, the Negro incidence was more than 13 times as high as for whites—an important statistic,

March 13, 1969

Dr. Jensen said, because "if environmental factors were mainly responsible for producing such differences, one should expect a lesser Negro-white discrepancy at the upper [socioeconomic] levels."

A 1967 survey of Negro and white children in a California school district found that Negroes lagged only 3.8 points in the lowest socioeconomic category—but the gap widened to 15.5 points in comparing white and Negro children from professional and managerial families.

Over all, Dr. Jensen said, one summation of the total literature on this subject up to 1965 found that in studies with subjects grouped by class, the upperstatus Negro children averaged 2.6 points below the low-status whites. The author of this summary, Dr. Audrey M. Shuey, wrote:

"It seems improbable that upper and middle-class colored children would have no more culture opportunities provided them than white children of the lower and lowest class."

To buttress his argument that genetics—not environment—plays the major role in Negro I.Q. scores, Dr. Jensen mentioned the American Indians as actually being the most "disadvantaged" of racial groups included in the Coleman Report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1966. In almost every way, this report found, the environmental rating of Indians is as far below the Negro average as the Negro average is below that of whites.

Despite this, in scores on both ability and achievement tests, it was discovered that Indians averaged six to eight points above Negroes.

USES OF TESTS

Intelligence tests, Dr. Jensen said, satisfactorily measure intelligence as defined by the psychologists in line with "objective reality"—the educational and occupational demands of modern society. Even so, he believes, the findings open up many questions about the course that U.S. education should take in times ahead.

Mentioned in some detail were child-development tests that placed Negro infants considerably ahead of whites in motor skills and noncognitive abilities. One study found 60 per cent of Negro infants—compared with 30 per cent for white infants—doing well between the ages of 9 and 12 months in walking and "pat-a-cake" muscular co-ordination. Even in nonmotor items, Negro infants up to six months of age in the poorest section of Durham, N.C., scored six to eight points above white norms.

In still another study, Dr. Jensen told of repeatedly showing and naming to children about 20 unrelated but familiar objects, after which the youngsters were told to recall as many of the items as possible, in any order that came to mind.

Repeated testing, said the University of California psychologist, revealed that lower and middle-class children did about equally well, though their I.Q.'s differed by 15 to 20 points.

The I.Q. differential, however, became clear when 20 familiar objects again were presented in a random order—but the objects this time could be grouped into conceptual categories such as food, furniture and clothing.

White children, in this test, tended to recall the items in "clusters" corresponding to the common categories. Negro children displayed significantly less of this conceptual clustering. Even though they recognized the concepts, the Negro children did not appear to respond as instinctively as white children did, Dr. Jensen said.

DIFFERENT REQUIREMENTS

A deficiency in conceptual ability, Dr. Jensen added, need not have the importance currently attached to it as the ultimate yardstick of fitness to play a productive role in modern society. Job descriptions, he sug-

gested, should be reviewed to see whether the educational and mental-test requirements that now bar many "disadvantaged" persons are necessary.

Also recommended were smaller, more intensive and more carefully focused programs of "compensatory" education than those tried so far. Massive experiments such as New York City's "Higher Horizons" program were seen as disappointments because they tended merely to offer bigger doses of generalized "cognitive" learning. Dr. Jensen said such efforts should use as their basis instead the "associative" learning skills possessed by many poor children.

TIMETABLE OF LEARNING

Some basic skills can be acquired by rote learning at an early age, Dr. Jensen said—and ways should be found to transfer such memorized learning in a lasting way to the later stages of learning. He gave this explanation:

"Too often, if a child does not learn the school subject matter when taught in a way that depends largely on being average or above average on general intelligence, he does not learn at all, so that we find high-school students who have failed to learn basic skills which they could easily have learned many years earlier by means that do not depend much on general intelligence. . . . If a child cannot show that he 'understands' the meaning of $1 + 1 = 2$ in some abstract, verbal, cognitive sense, he is in effect not allowed to go on to learn $2 + 2 = 4$. I am reasonably convinced that all the basic scholastic skills can be learned by children with normal associative learning ability, provided the instructional techniques do not make general intelligence the *sine qua non* of being able to learn."

As one example of what can be done, he told of a preschool program at the University of Illinois which centered sharply on specific skills—language, reading and arithmetic—considered essential in developing the cognitive process. A high degree of pupil attention and participation was stressed in the experiment, along with emphatic repetition. In general, the Illinois experiment put less stock on I.Q. gains than in scholastic performance. The result, Dr. Jensen said, was that achievement levels of the "disadvantaged" youngsters compared favorably with those of children whose I.Q.'s ranged 10 to 20 points higher.

OPPOSED TO SEGREGATION

Dr. Jensen made it clear that he is opposed to racial segregation. He said: "All persons must be regarded on the basis of their individual qualities and merits, and all social, educational and economic institutions must have built into them the mechanisms for insuring and maximizing the treatment of persons according to their individual behavior." While the article in the "Harvard Educational Review" did not specify how this could be accomplished in classrooms, Dr. Jensen on other occasions has mentioned such methods as small groupings of children and the use of computer-assisted teaching which could enable each child to learn through his own pattern of mental skills.

Required more than anything else, Dr. Jensen suggested, is for educational theorists to abandon "doctrinaire attitudes" on questions related to racial inequalities, and to undertake scientific inquiry—with "no holds barred." He concluded:

"Diversity rather than uniformity of approaches and aims would seem to be the key to making education rewarding for children of different patterns of ability. The reality of individual differences thus need not mean educational rewards for some children and frustration and defeat for others."

IN RESPONSE TO DR. JENSEN

Controversy already is developing among scholars over Dr. Arthur R. Jensen's views on

the role of heredity in human intelligence and in racial differences in I.Q.

Early responses suggest that Dr. Jensen will get a measure of support for his criticism of extreme "environmentalists" who discount heredity almost entirely. Also being voiced is agreement that remedial or "compensatory" education for poor children has been "oversold."

Some qualifications

This support for Dr. Jensen, however, is qualified in most cases—sometimes heavily—by questioning of his research and some of his conclusions. That is the picture that emerges from comments of authorities invited by the "Harvard Educational Review" to reply to Dr. Jensen.

A geneticist, Dr. James F. Crow of the University of Wisconsin, found himself "in substantial agreement" with Dr. Jensen's conclusions.

"Races are characterized by different gene frequencies, and there is no reason to think that genes for behavioral traits are different in this regard," Dr. Crow said. He added, however, that "this is not to say that the magnitude and direction of genetic racial differences is predictable."

Dr. Crow referred to a study quoted by Dr. Jensen which showed that American Indians did better than Negroes in intelligence testing, despite a lower socioeconomic status. Dr. Crow said of this example: "It can be argued that being white or being black in our society changes one or more aspects of the environment so importantly as to account for the difference."

Dr. Carl Bereiter, a former University of Illinois psychologist now with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto, agreed that the heritability of intelligence is "unquestionably high." He did not comment specifically on the racial issue, but suggested that the Berkeley psychologist may have underestimated I.Q. gains that might result from properly designed and administered "compensatory" education.

Overstatements

Another psychologist, Dr. Lee J. Cronbach of Stanford University, said:

"Dr. Jensen has girded himself for a holy war against 'environmentalists,' and his zeal leads him into overstatements and misstatements. The genetic populations that we call races no doubt have different distributions of whatever genes influence the psychological processes. We are in no position to guess, however, which pools are inferior."

Current experiments, Dr. Cronbach continued, suggest that the lower-class children who have trouble in the "conceptual clustering" test mentioned in Dr. Jensen's article can overcome their initial weaknesses after getting simple instruction.

Also, he said, "The influence of environment on a trait with high heritability is dramatically apparent to the American Fullbrighter of average height who finds large numbers of today's Japanese youth towering over him." On an intellectual level, he said, mental tests in most cultures show generation-to-generation gains attributable to environment.

Infant intelligence

Along somewhat similar lines, Dr. J. McV. Hunt, University of Illinois psychologist, held that Dr. Jensen had overlooked much research, especially among infants, which suggested that circumstances can aid development of intelligence skills. Dr. Hunt said:

"He emphasizes quite heavily the temporary nature in many instances of I.Q. improvement, but neglects the possibility emerging in recent research that intelligence gains can become permanent when used as a base for further development in the individual child's conceptual skills."

This authority added:

cated presentation I've ever seen of the "Dr. Jensen has given the most sophisti-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 13, 1969

standard argument for heredity as a primary factor in human intelligence. He says many worthwhile things, but some of his argument is misleading. I'm willing to see more research on heredity, but I would hope that his emphasis on heredity and on what he calls the 'failure' of compensatory education won't weaken support for research and development of better programs of this sort."

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 5, 1969]

RACE OPINIONS OSTRACIZE PAIR

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It used to be literally worth a man's life, in the days of Copernicus, to express belief in the solar system, and today it's worth a man's political career in Britain and his social status in America to contend that there is any difference except color between the races.

Enoch Powell, the lynx-eyed Tory MP, who wants to limit Afro-Asian immigration into his country, gets much the same treatment for his opinion's sake that Carleton Putnam, author of *Race and Reason*, was meted out on the western shores of the Atlantic.

Both men, known to me but not to one another, are eminent scholars in the precise meaning of that loosely-used word.

—In 1967, Powell wiped up the floor with ex-Sen.-Paul Douglas at George Washington University in a debate on socialism. The Britisher is a man whom it's safer to pronounce than to argue with.

Carleton Putnam, a lanky Yankee of urbane men, author of a Scribner-published Theodore Roosevelt biography until ostracism chopped off the final volumes, asks only that the scientists quit their book-burning and acknowledge the mental inequalities of men.

When I last talked with Putnam, a Senate subcommittee was investigating malnutrition (called "hunger" in campaign rhetoric), and I brought up the natural question. Why is it always the Negroes who seem to go short of food, jobs, education and the other good things of American prosperity? Is it because as this subcommittee was knocking itself out to prove, the Negroes suffered from the white man's injustice?

"The black race, and every other race," said Putnam, "has been unjustly treated at times, and we should eradicate unfairness wherever it's discovered. But injustice is not a fundamental cause of poverty. If we could remove every vestige of injustice tomorrow, there would still be poverty in a free society. The basic cause of poverty is the variability of capacity among individuals, groups and races. The modern Axis (a black-white minority) has kept on telling this lie about injustice-causes-poverty."

It's not a "good" lie, then, like some of our many cheerful myths in religion and folklore?

"It's a bad lie," Putnam said. "Bad for the Negro because it gives him a grievance against the whites. And bad for the whites because it gives them guilt. The guilt feeling, causing so many of our leaders to fawn over the poor, has bred contempt for their elders on the part of the college generation."

You can't talk that way in our English-speaking democracies without being punished for it. When Enoch Powell cuts loose with a statement about the "alien intrusion of colored immigrants into 'England's green and pleasant land,'" he wins support from Opinion Research Center polls (82 per cent of British white adults agree with him), but he catches hell in his party and in the press.

A reputable U.S. news agency recently sent out a London-dated news story on Powell, which screeched like a witch-hunter. The supposedly objective reporter (or his editors at home) said that "sadly" the British people thought Powell to be correct. The story went on to name-drop such incendiary words as Hitler, Joe McCarthy and "extremism." It ended on the far out prophecy that Powell

was "waiting for the day" when "the climate is right" for unspeakable racial atrocities.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Feb. 17, 1969]

WARFARE IN CLASSROOMS MAY REVIVE PUTNAM IDEA

Do you recall when concerted efforts were made to instill a bit of common sense into national thinking on the racial turmoil? One of the tools distributed by concerned individuals and organizations was the Carleton Putnam book and pamphlets on "Race and Reason."

But the nation was so swallowed up in emotionalism over alleged racial incidents in the South until only a bare minimum of persons associated with the national news media would touch Mr. Putnam's thoughts with a 70-foot pole, but crusading "war" correspondents descended upon Dixie in droves to stir emotions to the point that some thought a new civil war against the South might be in the offing.

Things have changed. All the souped up theories of race-mixing have resulted in the threat of domestic war in Northern cities.

There is renewed interest in the thinking expressed a decade ago by Mr. Putnam and a handful of others.

Few things could be more significant than remarks of Dr. Arthur R. Jensen at an educational symposium in Los Angeles a few days ago. It was a symposium held in connection with the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association.

"It is reasonable hypothesis," the educational expert continued, "that hereditary factors as well as environmental factors play a part in this difference. The bulk of the evidence is that three-fourths of the variability of intelligence is accounted for by genetic factors in our present society.

"By not recognizing these differences," Dr. Jensen concluded, "we run the risk of failing to develop the various capabilities of all our people."

Not to dwell on the fact that it sometimes takes science a long time to catch up with common sense, we are reminded that five years ago the Federal court in Jackson officially recognized, though it seemed powerless to act upon, certain of those racial differences which are so well known to white and black folks alike, and are indeed what make them interesting to each other. The late Judge Sidney C. Mize, in the case of "Darrell Kenyatta Evers, et al. vs. Jackson Municipal Separate School District et al.," stated in his opinion of July 6, 1964:

"The Court concludes that white and Negro pupils of public school age have substantially different educational aptitudes and learning patterns which are innate in character and do not arise out of economic or social circumstance and which cannot therefore be changed or overcome by intermixed schooling or other change of condition or environment within the powers of this Court to decree. The Court finds such differences to be racial traits so directly related to the learning process as to reasonably require separate forms of instruction in separate schools if equal educational opportunity is to be made available to the children of both races."

Judge Mize concluded by urging—"a complete reconsideration of the decision in the 'Brown' case," i.e., the "Black Monday" decision of the Warren Court in 1954, on which subsequent moves of the Federal government to force school integration have been based. The Mississippi jurist was at one, as far as the merits of racially separate education are concerned, with Federal Judge Frank M. Scarlett of the Southern District of Georgia, who in the "Stell" case of 1963 had ordered separate schooling to be maintained in Savannah and Chatham County, Georgia, but had been overruled by the Fifth Circuit

Court of Appeals. Both Judge Scarlett and Judge Mize had heard extended and uncontradicted testimony by duly qualified scientific experts, notably including Dr. Henry E. Garrett, former President of the American Psychological Association, and Professor Emeritus of Psychology at Columbia University.

Waiving discussion of the rather obvious fact that the Federal courts really have no business administering schools at all, it is clear enough that in the long run the courts will have to rule on educational matters along lines which educational experts indicate. That is why the report of Dr. Jensen's research is so important. It is perhaps the beginning of a thorough reconsideration of the operation of genetic differences in society, as urged since October 1967 by Nobel Prize-winning physicist Dr. William B. Shockley of Stanford University.

With President Nixon reversing himself from an unreserved campaign statement on easing Federal pressure on classroom activities across the nation and with Health, Education, and Welfare commissar Finch going full speed on using Federal funds to whip educators in line in behalf of forced race-mixing in the schools, utter chaos is sure to follow.

Somewhere, sometime somebody will have to face up to this issue which the late Judge Mize said: "Cries out to be heard."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1969]

DISSENT IS REGISTERED TO REPORT ON NEGRO INTELLIGENCE LEVELS

(By Joseph Alsop)

The unspeakable has been spoken. The unmentionable has been mentioned. And this reporter would like to enter a qualified but vigorous dissent.

Arthur R. Jensen, professor of educational psychology at Berkeley and vice president of the American Educational Research Association, is the man who has mentioned the unmentionable. In a formidable paper in the Harvard Educational Review, he has said that human intelligence depends far more upon heredity than upon environment.

Thus he has frontal attacked the general belief that the ghetto environment is the sole cause of the poor performance of the children in the ghetto schools. Nor has he stopped here.

He has gone on to say, with a vast mass of figures seeming to prove his claim, that on average, the IQs of black Americans are about 15 points lower than the IQs of white Americans. In part, this is merely an assertion that on average, unsuccessful Americans are less intelligent than successful Americans.

In other words, children of white families of low social-economic status have substantially lower average IQs than children from white families of higher stature, as is also true of black children of different backgrounds. Yet Dr. Jensen insists that even after making allowance for this poor-rich differential there is also a clearly detectable racial difference.

For example, he points to comparative figures obtained by Prof. Rich Heber of the University of Wisconsin on percentages of children with IQs below 75 (or near to mental retardation) in white and black families at five levels of social-economic status. At the highest status level, there was already a difference, though a trifling difference, between the whites and the blacks.

But at level two, the low-IQ children were only 0.8 per cent of the white sample, against 14.5 per cent of the black sample. And this divergence was found all down the line, so that in the lowest level group, there were 7.8 per cent of low-IQ children among the whites, against 42.9 per cent of low-IQ black children.

This makes grim reading, unless someone can disprove Dr. Jensen, Dr. Heber, and all

the other factual data Dr. Jensen quotes. It must above all be noted, of course, that Dr. Jensen is dealing in percentages.

Hence his figures also mean that there are great numbers of very able, indeed brilliant black Americans, far above the white average and fully as intelligent as the very able whites. Otherwise, this gap between black and white average IQs would be much greater.

Yet there is no use being mealy-mouthed about it. Dr. Jensen is really saying that in addition to the handicaps wickedly imposed by prejudice and discrimination, the average black American begins the race of life with a detectable genetic handicap. And for the unduly large group of black Americans with IQs below 75, this handicap is grave enough to constitute a really massive problem in a high-technical society.

If Dr. Jensen's data cannot be successfully challenged (which seems unlikely), what then is one to say about his thesis? The first thing to say is that Dr. Jensen has failed to stress the crucial genetic role of both culture and history. This means, quite simply, that any human breeding population's culture and history can greatly influence the group's heredity, by biasing the selective process in one direction or the other.

Thus, both Chinese and Jewish cultures and histories have in different ways biased selection in favor of intelligence, and Chinese and Jewish children have substantially higher average IQs than non-Jewish white children. The same, one may be sure, is true of Blafran's wretched Ibos. Ibo culture has always placed an enormous premium on achievement and on status. Selection has therefore favored high achievers. Hence the Ibos have regularly and quite vastly outperformed other Nigerians; and this is the real root of the Blafran tragedy.

Viewed in this light, Dr. Jensen's findings only underline the solemn duty of the white majority to aid the black minority to escape from exclusion into equal opportunity. For slavery, discrimination and injustice have been the history of America's black minority, by no fault of theirs; and these experiences, too, have mainly shaped their culture—not without having an effect, one may be sure, on all the data Dr. Jensen has collected.

Yet the central fault of Dr. Jensen's remarkable, deeply disturbing paper is something else again. Quite simply, it is the bland dismissal of the only lever we can use, to enable the black minority to compete on equal terms with all other Americans. But Dr. Jensen's treatment of "compensatory education" must be examined in a second report.

A MONTGOMERY COUNTY MAN ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE ELECTION OFFICIALS ASSOCIATION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been increasing public and official interest in needed reforms in the election processes at all levels—and by the administration specifically in the area of electoral reform. Both political parties have listed this an area of special attention.

In my own State, the Maryland State Election Officials Association has done yeoman work during the last few years advising the Maryland General Assembly on election law reforms. In addition it

provides assistance to individual countries in new techniques in office management and in the general area of the conduct of elections. In the few years since the association was founded in 1963 it has been of great service to the lawmakers and the people of Maryland. The organization consists of election board members, chief clerks, board of registry members and board attorneys from the election board of Maryland's 23 counties and the city of Baltimore.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I learned that this group at their annual convention in Baltimore on February 20, 1969, chose as their president a very distinguished citizen of Montgomery County, Frederick A. Shand, chairman of the Montgomery County Board of Election Supervisors. Mr. Shand has served the people of Montgomery County with great distinction and I have every confidence that he will serve the State election officials with the same degree of devotion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Mr. Shand and the other officers chosen to serve with him, Gerald F. Devlin, of Prince Georges County, who was elected vice president, Paul Hishmeh, of Wicomico County, who was reelected treasurer and Mrs. Margaret Addison, of Charles County, the new secretary.

SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Slovak people living in their own country under the rule of the Soviet Union and those who escaped to this country, I ask that March 14, 1969, be recognized as "Slovak Independence Day."

Thirty years ago today the courageous Slovaks founded the free and independent Republic of Slovakia after enduring more than a thousand years of foreign rule, but their hope of freedom was short lived and their independence was almost illusory. At first they were subject to Nazi rule, until April 1945 when United States and Russian troops liberated the Slovaks and made them part of Czechoslovakia as they had been before their independence as a Nazi-sponsored state. In February 1948, the Bohemians and Slovaks of Czechoslovakia were taken over as a Russian satellite. It was in this capacity that they functioned until last August when Russia moved in troops to crush the reform movement under Premier Alexander Dubcek. All the world was shocked and dismayed to learn of the Soviet Union's brutal crime against self-determination.

I urge all Americans to take a few minutes of their time today to imagine what it is like to live under the tyrannies of both naziism and Soviet communism, and to have your independence snatched away each time you think it is just se-

cured. This is what the courageous Slovaks have had to face over and over.

Of course, many Slovaks have escaped to find freedom and opportunity in the United States, and as citizens they have contributed immeasurably to the religious, cultural, educational, industrial, and civic growth and betterment of our cities. But finding freedom in someone else's homeland is not quite the same as finding it in your own homeland.

Maybe in our thoughts today we should also remind ourselves to show our sympathy to the Slovaks by understanding and bolstering their hopes for a rebirth of freedom in their homeland.

Thus, in the best of American traditions—to recognize the independence of other nations—I ask that March 14, 1969, be recognized as "Slovak Independence Day," to stress the urgency of the situation of the Slovakian people and to honor the Slovakian people for their courage and forbearance.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse with all the vigor at my command and to urge upon my congressional colleagues the earliest consideration and passage of H.R. 770, introduced on the first day of this Congress by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), for himself and several of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, every Member is knowledgeable of the urgent need to improve the financing and funding practices of the civil service retirement system and to also make significant and needed improvements in the benefit structure of the Federal retirement laws. To add to my verbal support of this legislation, I have today submitted a companion bill to H.R. 770, in the hope that other Members will join me in reaffirming the decision of the House last year in again passing this bill.

For years the Congress has had the specter of bankruptcy of the civil service retirement fund looming over the horizon. It is time that the method of financing this fund be overhauled. We must assure every employee entering the Government's service today that payments to retirees of the future will be guaranteed. Mr. Speaker, this is not a guarantee we can make to him today. This fund is currently over \$55 billion in the red. This bill will correct the problem and put the affairs of this fund in order. Again I strongly urge quick action on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is also urgently needed to improve the benefits to annuitants under the civil service retirement system. The reduction of the period determining average salary for annuity computation purposes from the highest 5 years to the highest 3 years as provided in this bill is completely justified and